INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT
FOR:
Central Indiana Education Service Center (CIESC)

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Approaching/Meeting Standard (2.5)	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Meeting Standard (3)	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting	Satisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Meeting Standard (3)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Satisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 4-7:1	Meeting Standard (3)		

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since CIESC's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).

ACTION NEEDED:

NONE

1

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: CIESC   **DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 2/05/08**
REVIEWER: MC

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	**ALL** of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	Tutor training agenda Sign-in sheets		X	Tutor training includes contracts, best practices, schedules, individual learning plans, standards, IDOE policies and procedures, reading, and math.
Progress Reporting	**ALL** of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	Progress reports from MSD Lawrence, MSD Pike, and MSD Perry Documentation of reports sent Timeline for sending progress reports District contracts		X	Progress reports include standards addressed in Math and Language Arts, attendance information, and comments on student progress. Progress reports include information on how students are improving achievement. Some progress reports included a teacher phone number that parents could call with questions, which is great. Progress reports from MSD Pike and MSD Lawrence included pre-assessment scores, but MSD Perry progress reports did not. As per the progress report checklist, the progress report should also include the following: • Student goals from the SES agreement • A written statement regarding how parents can provide feedback on how the progress report could be improved Both districts surveyed indicated that progress reports have been sent on a regular basis and in a timely manner.
	ALL of the following:	Sample SES		X	Individual learning plans and SES agreements have specific learning goals, but goals did not

2

Assessment and Individual Program Design	-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.	agreements Sample pre- and post-assessment scores Sample individual learning plans Copies of assessments Description of process for developing individual learning plans Teacher input form Parent input form		include "how much" (student will show gains from pre to post assessment. How much of a gain? Student will show growth in reading standards—how much growth? Improve writing development as evidenced by rubric scored writing samples—the method of determining improvement is fine, but how much improvement? One rubric level? All goals should include how much improvement or change is expected.). Individual learning plans include goals that are based on pre-assessments and identify areas for improvement. Teacher and parent input are also used in developing the learning plans. MSD Lawrence individual learning plans include specific items/standards that the student would be expected to master. It may also be helpful to include specific instructional strategies that could be used to achieve the goals. SES agreements did not indicate that writing would be covered; however, individual learning plans included goals for improving writing development and language conventions. The individual learning plan should mirror the SES agreement. If writing development and language conventions are to be covered in the tutoring, they should be checked on the SES agreement. Assessment copies were submitted to demonstrate correlation to the Indiana academic standards. The math assessment specifically lists each standard that the question covers, and the reading assessment (DRA) covers the standards of word recognition, fluency, and vocabulary; reading comprehension; and literary response and analysis.

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: CIESC

SITE: Harrison Hill Elementary, Clinton Young Elementary

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): Rm. 36, Rm. 34, Rm. 22
Rm. 305, Rm. 306, Rm. 302

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 6

DATE: 1/09/08, 1/22/08

REVIEWER: MC/ST

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:30; 4:00

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
			X		Students worked on math and reading. In one room, a group of students used workbooks to work on multiplication and grouping. The tutor had students answer questions about strategies and asked them to help each other when needed. One group played a probability game with dice. In this room, students primarily worked independently. In another room, students worked in pairs and used cards to make math problems. Then the tutor brought the group together and explained a subtraction game. Each student was given a bag with dimes and pennies in it and were told to practice subtraction and regrouping. The tutor went over concepts with students using the overhead projector prior to beginning the game. In another room, students worked on reading. In one group, students read a book and the tutor "helper" helped them sound out words. After these students finished reading their books, they were told to return to the larger group. In the larger group, the tutor and the group read a book together. On occasion, the tutor stopped to ask comprehension questions and discuss vocabulary words. At another site, one room of students read and answered questions about state birds. The students took turns responding to questions. Students then received another worksheet and worked on comparing and contrasting using Venn diagrams. The tutor helped students figure out what could be compared and asked students questions about comparing and contrasting. Most lessons met the description in CIESC's application but in a few, the components of lessons described in CIESC's application did not seem to be present.

Lesson matches original description in provider application					For example, in one room, some students appeared to work almost completely independently on worksheets or activities with very minimal tutor interaction. One group of two students worked for nearly 15 minutes without any tutor interaction at all. In another room, the entire session appeared to be worksheet-based. Though the tutor did provide some individual intervention, some students received minimal tutor interaction. The tutor did not appear to introduce concepts or discuss strategies; instead, students just worked on worksheets. While individual work is part of CIESC's program as described in its application, it is important that students have some instructor interaction while working independently to ensure that they are on task and understanding concepts. Moreover, CIESC's description in its application alludes to conceptual units, review, and practice. While independent work on worksheets could address some of these things, it was not always clear that students working independently had the opportunity to review, practice, and go over concepts. Additionally, computer work does not appear in CIESC's application, so it is unclear why students were working (primarily unsupervised) on a computer program in one of the rooms at one site.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Time on task is appropriate			X		In most rooms, students were on task (especially while working directly with a tutor), When students were working as a group with tutors, they seemed to be having fun and enjoying the lesson and stayed on task. In a few rooms where students were working independently, tutors did a good job rotating between students and ensuring that they were quiet and on task. However, some tutors struggled with group size in keeping students on task, especially where students were supposed to be working independently. For example, in one room, a group of students worked for 10-15 minutes unsupervised on the computer and often became noisy and unfocused. In another group in the same room, some students who were supposed to be working independently had trouble staying on task unless the tutor was with them, sometimes to the point of distracting other students. In another room, students who were working on worksheets sometimes got noisy or had trouble staying on task when the tutor was not interacting with them. Tutors tried to rotate between students working independently to keep them on task, but sometimes group size made it difficult.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X		In each classroom, tutors had folders with individual learning plans and progress reports for students. Tutors working with small or large groups had clearly planned lessons and did a good job providing conceptual overviews and introducing topics. Tutors generally seemed to have a good idea of students' individual levels.
Student/instructor ratio: 4-7:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Ratios were: 1:7, 1:4, 1:7, 1:7, 1:4, 1:5, and 1:6, which meet ratio described in amended application. As noted, in some cases tutors appeared to struggle with larger group sizes, especially when students were supposed to be working independently.